



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/708,763	03/24/2004	Heng-Chien CHEN	TRAP0011USA	2762
27765	7590	07/19/2007	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION P.O. BOX 506 MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			SINGH, RAMNANDAN P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/19/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com  
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com  
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/708,763	CHEN, HENG-CHIEN
Examiner	Art Unit	
Ramnandan Singh	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Drawings*

1. New corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in this application because Figures 1 and 2 do not have proper margins . Applicant is advised to employ the services of a competent patent draftsperson outside the Office, as the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office no longer prepares new drawings. The corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The requirement for corrected drawings will not be held in abeyance.
2. The drawings are objected to because Fig. 2 contains acronyms, such as AP (114) and VIP (118). Spell out full words. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and

appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claims 1, 9 and 17 are objected to because of the following informalities: It is improper to use acronyms in claims.

Claim 1 recites "a data of an IP-based PBX" in line 1. Write a full word for the acronym, "IP".

Similarly, claim 9 recites " IP sharing device" in line 2. Spell out "IP". Claim 17 recite "the sender is an xDSL modem" in line 2. Spell out "DSL".

Further, claim 9 recites "IP sharing device device" in line 5 and in lines 10-11. Delete one "device".

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of copending Application No. 10/707,380. Although the conflicting claims

are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 9 of the instant application is a broad version of claim 1 of the co-pending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-2, 5-8, 9-10, 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(9) as being anticipated by Beasley et al [US 20020167965 A1].

Regarding claim 9, Beasley et al a telecommunication system, as shown in Figs. 2, 6, comprising:

an IP sharing device (i.e. DHCP server) for providing a virtual IP address [Para: 0079-0080; 0207];

an IP-based PBX extension electrically connected to the IP sharing device for requesting the virtual IP address from the IP sharing device, wherein the IP-based PBX extension having the virtual IP address is capable of outputting a packet having the data through the IP sharing device [Para: 0052];

a host [(602) [Para: 0019; 0062]; and

a sender electrically connected to the IP sharing device, the sender with a first IP address capable of delivering the packet received from the IP sharing device to the host with a second IP address through a computer network [Figs. 1-2]; wherein the host extracts the data from the packet [Figs. 2-6; claims 1-2, 8-10].

Claim 1 is essentially similar to claim 9 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claim 10, Beasley et al further teach the telecommunication system wherein the IP-based PBX extension utilizes a wireless transmission protocol to access the IP sharing device for

requesting the virtual IP address [Figs. 1-2; Para: 0009; 0043-0046; 0053]; (“OR” is interpreted as “alternative”).

Claim 2 is essentially similar to claim 10 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claims 5-8 and 13-16, the limitations are shown above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 3-4,11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beasley et al as applied to claim 10 above, and further in view of Kung et al [US 7,075,918 B1].

Regarding claim 11, Beasley et al do not teach expressly wired transmission protocols.

Kung et al teach using an Ethernet 802.11 connection compatible with category 5 unshielded twisted pairs [col. 22, lines 26-34].

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Kung et al with Beasley et al for coupling remote computers [Kung et al; col. 22, lines 32-33].

Claim 3 is essentially similar to claim 11 and is rejected for the reasons stated above.

Regarding claims 4 and 12, the combination of Beasley et al and Kung et al teaches these limitations as shown above.

Regarding claim 17, Kung et al further teach the telecommunication system, wherein the sender is an xDSL modem or a cable modem [col. 24, lines 49-64].

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ramnandan Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-7529. The examiner can normally be reached on M-TH (8:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ramnandan Singh  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2614

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "RNP Singh".